

# PERIPHERAL ARABIC DIALECTS

Faruk Akkuş

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The subject of this article is the so-called peripheral Arabic dialects, i.e. dialects of Arabic spoken in non-Arab countries, with a focus on Anatolian Arabic and Central Asian Arabic dialects, as well as brief discussions of Cypriot Maronite Arabic and Khorasan Arabic in some parts.<sup>1</sup> For the study of the history of the Arabic dialects, peripheral Arabic dialects, which lost contact many centuries ago with the mainstream Arabic-speaking world, are crucial. These dialects are different from Arabic-based pidgins and creoles (cf. Tosco and Manfredi 2013 for an overview), and Arabic spoken as a medium for interethnic communication. Owens (2001) takes Central Asian Arabic dialects as representative of peripheral Arabic dialects, calling peripheral Arabic ‘Araboid language’, which can no longer be regarded as Arabic due to the extensive structural changes it has undergone.<sup>2</sup> A review of other dialects, however, reveals that not all peripheral Arabic dialects have undergone such extensive structural changes, and so it is plausible to speak of a continuum of change spreading from Anatolia to Central Asia.

Peripheral Arabic dialects manifest various linguistic peculiarities that are mainly due to close linguistic contact with Iranian (Indo-European), Turkic languages, Aramaic or Greek. There is a great deal of inter-dialectal and even intra-dialectal variation, to which a chapter of the current length cannot do justice; I will not endeavor to cover these matters exhaustively, but will provide a review of the state of the art. Linguistically, the study of peripheral dialects is significant since they exhibit rich materials for the study of problems of historical and general linguistics. As commonly encountered in historical linguistics, it is hard to decide for some of the linguistic changes whether they are contact-induced or internal developments. Such studies have the potential to draw attention to these dialects, and contribute to potential revitalization efforts.

This article is organized as follows: In section 2 the historical background and a perspective on the current situation of peripheral Arabic dialects are presented. Section 3 is a review and discussion of the critical issues and topics in the study of peripheral dialects in a comparative manner. The section presents issues from phonology, morphology and syntax of various dialects. The chapter deliberately chooses to focus on a few issues in detail, rather than giving a general picture of a larger number of issues. In many places, Sason Arabic is used as a point of reference, but a more comprehensive look at Sason Arabic is undertaken in Section 4, where this language is investigated as a case study illustrative of changes across many varieties. Section 5 gives a picture of the present situation in studies of peripheral dialects and suggests some future directions, along with concluding remarks.

## 2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND PERSPECTIVE

This section focuses on the history of Arabic varieties spoken in Turkey and Central Asia. Arabic dialects are spoken in three distinct areas in Turkey (Jastrow 2006a, p. 87):

- (1) a. The coastal region of the Eastern Mediterranean from Hatay to Mersin and Adana.  
b. Parts of Urfa province close to the Syrian border.

c. Eastern Anatolia, an area encompassing the Turkish provinces of Mardin, Siirt, Diyarbakır, Batman, Bitlis, Muş.

Only the dialects spoken in Eastern Anatolia are called Anatolian Arabic. These dialects are part of the larger Mesopotamian dialect area, and they can be considered as part of the Iraqi Arabic group. Dialects in (1b) are a part of the Bedouin dialects of the Syrian desert (Jastrow 2006a), whereas those in (1a) are linguistically part of the Syrian Arabic dialect area.

Anatolian *qəltu*-dialects are divided into four major groups.<sup>3</sup>

- (2) Anatolian Arabic Dialects (Jastrow 2006a, p. 87)
  - i. Mardin group
  - ii. Siirt group
  - iii. Diyarbakır group
  - iv. Kozluk-Sason-Muş group

Although the Mardin dialect has been known for over a century, most of these dialects were brought to the attention of the Arabic linguistic community in the second half of the 20th century. The comprehensive picture of the Anatolian Arabic dialect group is due to the discovery of a number of Anatolian *qəltu*-dialects by Otto Jastrow and his former students (Jastrow 1973, 1978, Talay 2001, Wittrich 2001) (see Section 5). The Mardin dialects can be viewed as the most conservative dialect group among Anatolian Arabic varieties, due to their geographical proximity to north-eastern Syria and northern Iraq. In the outer circle, the Mardin dialects are surrounded by a number of more innovative dialects, namely the isolated dialect of Āzəx, and the dialect groups of Siirt, Kozluk-Sason-Muş, and Diyarbakır. It should, however, be noted that these more innovative dialects might have retained features that have been lost in other Anatolian varieties, which makes them conservative in that respect. For instance, the Kozluk-Sason-Muş group are the only dialects to have retained the indefinite element *-ma*.

Anatolian Arabic dialects are spoken as minority languages, where the current linguistic situation is marked by bi- or tri-lingualism. Most of the speakers speak Kurdish (the regional Indo-Iranian language) and Turkish (the official language). As Jastrow (2006a, p. 88) points out, the phenomenon of diglossia is not observed in Anatolia; instead Turkish occupies the position of the ‘High variety’, and Anatolian Arabic, the ‘Low variety’, occupies a purely dialectal position. In addition, speakers of different dialects speak different languages as well. For instance, a substantial number of Sason Arabic speakers know Zazaki and those of Armenian origin also speak an Armenian dialect. Likewise, Cypriot Arabic speakers are bilingual in Greek. Speakers of almost all *qəltu*-dialects (except for the Iraqi Maslawi dialect) do not attach prestige to their native language, regarding it as ‘broken Arabic’ and show no noticeable effort to preserve it or pass it on to the next generations. In addition, the number of speakers has decreased substantially due to the constant persecution, particularly of Christian speakers, and also to Jews leaving the area. These factors also led to significant losses in the number of idioms, expressions in dialects, and in some cases the expressive power of the dialects. Although Anatolian dialects have much in common, the linguistic differences among the various groups are considerable. In fact, the degree of mutual intelligibility varies among the speakers of different Anatolian Arabic varieties, to the point of complete unintelligibility in some cases.

Anatolian Arabic and Central Asian Arabic dialects manifest commonalities in several aspects: (i) separation from the Arabic speaking world, (ii) contact with regional languages, which

affected them strongly, (iii) multilingualism of speakers. These properties extend to Cypriot Maronite Arabic dialect as well.

Central Asian Arabic refers to dialects spoken in Uzbekistan (Versteegh 1984, Chikovani 2005) and Afghanistan (Ingham 1994, 2005, Kieffer 2000). The history of Central Asian varieties is not clear and could date back to the 7th-8th centuries and the Islamization of Uzbekistan. In fact, they can also be included in the Mesopotamian group since they seem to have originated in southern Iraq and exhibit certain resemblances with the varieties of Northern Mesopotamia. Apart from this, their connections with other Arabic dialects remain to be investigated. The discovery and study of the Central Asian dialects goes back to 1930s. G. Tseretelli demonstrated the existence of two different Arabic dialects in Central Asia, the Bukhara and Qashqa-darya dialects, after his first scholarly expedition in 1935 (Chikovani 2005).

- (3) Central Asian Arabic Dialects
  - a. Uzbekistan Arabic
    - i. Bukhara dialect
    - ii. Qashqa-darya dialect
  - b. Arabic dialects in Afghanistan
  - c. Arabic dialects in Iran<sup>4</sup>

The Bukhara and Qashqa-darya dialects have been separated from the rest of the Arabic speaking world for many centuries and this has been an important factor in the development of the Central Asian Arabic dialects. At the same time, they have been in contact with the Indo-European language Tajik, as well as the Turkic language Uzbek. Chikovani (2005, p. 128) reports that most Arabic speakers of the Bukhara region are more fluent in Tajik, while Qashqa-darya Arabs are more fluent in Uzbek.

Cypriot Maronite Arabic (CyA) is the home language of a small community of about 1300 Maronite Christians (bilingual in Arabic and Greek) of the village of Kormakiti in north-west Cyprus (Tsiapera 1969, Borg 1985, Versteegh 1997, Hadjidemetriou 2007). Borg (1985, p. 154, 2004) shows that CyA has retained a fairly transparent areal affiliation with the contemporary Arabic vernacular despite its isolated situation for several centuries. It manifests a number of formal features characteristic of (i) the Arabic colloquials of Greater Syria and (ii) the Anatolian *qəltu*-dialects.

Linguistic studies have focused on phonetic, morphological, lexical, and to a lesser degree syntactic features in the speech of bi- or multilingual individuals resulting from the influence of the contact languages. Such influences have led to convergence with the structurally different Indo-European and Turkic languages. It is possible to say that this convergence is at a more advanced stage in Central Asian dialects than in Anatolian dialects, and we can speak of a continuum of change in which Uzbekistan Arabic lies on one end, to the point where Jastrow (2005, p. 133) claims that it has developed into an independent language. Thus, the contacts can be viewed as a long process in which quantitative changes in some dialects ultimately led to qualitative changes.

### 3 CRITICAL ISSUES AND TOPICS

This section is a review of divergences peripheral Arabic dialects manifest from the non-peripheral dialects in phonology, morphology, lexicon and syntax, and different reflexes of these divergences across dialects.

#### 3.1. Phonology

The interdental fricatives have developed differently in each Anatolian Arabic dialect. (4) shows that while the Mardin dialect has retained the Old Arabic fricatives, they have shifted to sibilants in Sason,<sup>5</sup> to dental stops in Diyarbakır, and to labiodental fricatives in Tillo/Siirt dialects (examples of Mardin and Diyarbakır dialects are from Jastrow 2007, and Tillo/Siirt from Lahdo 2009, see also Talay 2011).

(4)		<b>Mardin</b>	<b>Sason</b>	<b>Tillo/Siirt</b>	<b>Diyarbakır</b>	
	t̤	‘three’	<i>tāte</i>	<i>sʳāse</i>	<i>fāfe</i>	<i>tlāte</i>
	ḏ	‘he shot’	<i>ḏarab</i>	<i>zarab</i>	<i>yarab</i>	<i>ḏarab</i>
	ḏ	‘he took’	<i>axaḏ</i>	<i>ağaz</i>	<i>axav</i>	<i>axad</i>

Moreover, the interdental voiceless fricative /t̤/ sometimes shifts to /š/ in Sason, e.g. *šelč* ‘snow’ < OA *talğ*, also cf. *talğ* in the Arabic dialect of the Jews of Iskenderun, where as in the Diyarbakır dialect, shift of the interdentals to the corresponding dentals is observed (Arnold 2007, p. 7).

Loss of initial *h* is encountered in several dialects. While in the Mardin group dialects *h* of the pronouns and adverbs is retained, in other dialects, *h* can be elided (see section 4.2.2 for demonstrative pronouns).

(5)		<b>Mardin</b>	<b>Sason</b>	<b>Tillo/Siirt</b>	<b>Diyarbakır</b>
	‘this’	<i>hāḏa</i>	<i>ala</i>	<i>āva</i>	<i>āda</i>

A characteristic feature of *qəltu* dialects is the use of the inflectional morpheme *-tu* in the 1sg perfect form of the verb, e.g. *ayal-tu* ‘I ate’.

As shown in (6), only the Mardin group dialects have retained the traditional formation of the derived verb stems which is characterized by the vowel *a* in the last syllable of the perfect stem, whereas in the remaining three dialect groups the *a* vowel has been changed to *ə* apparently by analogy to the imperfect (with a few examples in Sason dialect, where the Mardin pattern is observed). In Diyarbakır group dialects *ə* in word-final closed syllables is realized as [e], whereas in Siirt group dialects *ə* is secondarily split into *e* and *o* (Jastrow 2007, p. 66).

(6)		<b>Mardin</b>	<b>Sason</b>	<b>Tillo/Siirt</b>	<b>Diyarbakır</b>	
	II	‘to load, teach’	<i>ḥammal</i>	<i>yalleḥ</i>	<i>ḥalleḥ</i>	<i>xalleḥ</i>
	III	‘to insert’	<i>dēxal</i>	<i>dāxal</i>	<i>dēxel</i>	<i>dēxel</i>
	X	‘to ask’	<i>staxbar</i>	<i>ʳstaxber</i>	<i>staxber</i>	<i>staxber</i>

In terms of phonology, Uzbekistan Arabic maintains some Old Arabic features, in that pharyngeals and emphatics, e.g. *ṭ* and *ṣ*, have been preserved,<sup>6</sup> as well as velar fricatives and the uvular *q*

(Ratcliffe 2005, p. 142). Similar to the development in Sason Arabic, Arabic interdentals *t̪*, *d̪*, *ð̪* have been shifted here to sibilants, *s*, *z*, *ʒ*, due to Tajik influence. Uzbekistan Arabic is also quite conservative in terms of lexicon. Ratcliffe (2005, p. 142) reports that the majority of the lexicon is of Arabic origin, and a random count turned up ten percent non-Arabic vocabulary.

According to Vocke and Waldner (1982, cited Versteegh 1997, p. 214), 24 percent of the lexicon in the Anatolian dialects consists of foreign loans, although dialects differ with respect to the language from which they borrow most. Loanwords from Kurdish, Zazaki, Turkish and Aramaic are a common pathway through which new phonemes have come to exist in Anatolian Arabic (Jastrow 1978, 2006a, Talay 2001, Akkuş, to appear). These phonemes are /p/, /č/, /v/ and /g/.

- (7) *parda* ‘curtain’ [ < Turkish *perde*] (examples are from Sason)  
*čāx* ‘time, moment’ [ < Kurdish *čāx*]  
*mazgūn* ‘sickle’ [ < Aramaic *magzūnā*, cf. Turoyo *magzūno*]<sup>7</sup>

In Central Asian dialects too, the consonants *p* and *č*, may occur both in loanwords and Arabic lexemes (e.g. *poličta* ‘pillow’, *čaj* ‘tea’, Chikovani 2005, p. 129).

A characteristic feature of the Qashqa-darya dialect (QAD) is the absence of phonological length distinctions, where vowel length is not contrastive, but its occurrence can be ascribed to stress and other prosodic factors. As a result of Tajik influence, *ā* has shifted to *ō* in both Central Asian dialects, e.g. *ğawāb* > *ğawōb* ‘answer’ (Chikovani 2005, p. 129). Moreover, in QAD, voiced consonants are generally devoiced, e.g. *arkup* < ‘*arkaba* ‘ascended’ (Chikovani 2005, p. 128).

The phonology of Sason Arabic and CyA is characterized by the complete absence of emphatic consonants, which have been fused with their plain counterparts, e.g. *pasal* ‘onions’ in Sason < *başal* OA, *peđa* ‘egg’ in CyA < *bayđa* OA (Borg 1997, p. 223). One contact-induced change in CyA concerns the consonant clusters. In this dialect, as in Cypriot and Standard Greek, biconsonantal stop clusters are subject to a manner dissimilation constraint (Borg 1985, 1997), replacing the first stop by its corresponding fricative (cf. Gk. /nixta/ < *nikta* ‘night’):

- (8) /xtilt/ ‘you (m.sg.) killed’ < |ktilt| < \*qtilt (Borg 1997, p. 224)  
 /fkum/ ‘I get up’ < |pkum| < \*baqu:m  
 /htuft/ ‘I have written’ < ktupt

### 3.1.1. Devoicing

In Anatolian Arabic, voiced consonants in word final position have a tendency to become devoiced, probably due to Turkish influence. For example, /b/ has /p/ as an allophone in this environment. /b/ is mainly realized as voiceless in final pre-pausal position, e.g.: *anep* ‘grape(s)’, cf. OA *inab*; *ğarip* ‘stranger’, cf. OA *ğarib*. This might reflect a process of transition as Lahdo (2009) points out that the incidence of devoicing in other dialects as well increases over time. Devoicing of /b/ is also attested before voiceless consonants: *haps* ‘prison’, cf. OA *habs*. But it should be noted that this does not hold in all instances, supporting the claim that the language is undergoing a transition. Moreover, the lack of a written form contributes to this situation.

Further examples come from Mardin dialect, e.g. *axad* ‘he took’, *katab* [p‘] ‘he wrote’ (Jastrow 2006a, p. 90). In Sason Arabic, on the other hand, devoicing applies not necessarily in word-final position in some words, but in the environment of voiceless consonants, e.g. *təšreb* ‘you (m.) drink’, *šrəpt* ‘you (m.) drank’ or *təmseg* ‘you (m.) catch’, *masakt* ‘you (m.) caught’.

### 3.1.2. *Imāla*

One way long mid vowels entered the lexicon of Anatolian Arabic is through the process known as *imāla* (another way is via loanwords from Turkish and Kurdish, e.g. *xōrt* ‘young man’ [< Kurdish] and *tēl* ‘wire’ [< Turkish]). The so-called *imāla* phenomenon is one of the most characteristic features in the phonology of *qəltu*-Arabic. In the context of Anatolian Arabic, this refers to raising of the long [ā] vowel to a closed [ē], a sound shift triggered by the presence of an [i] vowel, either short or long, in the preceding or following syllable (Jastrow 2006a, b). *Imāla* is very old in Arabic, and it now only survives in three separate areas, Libya, Malta and *qəltu* dialects (Owens 2009, p. 212). Thus the Arabic plural *dakākin* ‘shops’ (from the sg. *dukkān* ‘shop’) yields *dəkēkīn* by way of *imāla*. When the *imāla* has been triggered by a short [i], this vowel may have subsequently been lost, e.g. *klēb* ‘dogs’ which is derived from the Old Arabic plural *kilāb*. Consider (9).

- (9) *Imāla* (\* ā > ē) in Anatolian Arabic
- |                   |   |                        |
|-------------------|---|------------------------|
| <b>Old Arabic</b> |   | <b>Sason</b>           |
| <i>dakakīn</i>    | > | <i>dəkēkīn</i> ‘shops’ |
| <i>kilāb</i>      | > | <i>kəlēb</i> ‘dogs’    |

Cypriot Maronite Arabic also displays a robust system of *imāla* (Borg 1985, p. 54-63), with some regular and irregular exceptions. For instance, Class III verbs do not have *imāla* in the imperfect, e.g. *pi-saʕed* ‘he helps’ (Borg 1985, p. 96, cited Owens 2009, p. 218).

## 3.2. Morphology

This section mainly looks at the personal pronouns and copula in peripheral dialects. In terms of morphology, Anatolian Arabic dialects have much in common. For instance, the gender distinction in the 2nd and 3rd person pl. in verbs and pronouns has not been retained. Other distinctive features that signal that a dialect is Anatolian include the use of the negation *mō* instead of *mā* with the imperfect, and the suffix *-n* instead of *-m* in the second and third person plural (e.g. in Sason Arabic *bēden* ‘their house’).

### 3.2.1. Personal Pronouns

Table 1 shows the independent personal pronouns in Anatolian Arabic (Sason Arabic, Mardin (Jastrow 2006a) and Daragözü (a Kozluk group dialect, Jastrow 1973, 2006a) and the other dialect Bo Isaksson (2005) documented in a village northwest of Sason, Xalīle) and Uzbekistan Arabic dialects (Chikovani 2000, p. 189-190).

(10)

	Sason	Xalīle	Daragözü	Mardin	Bukhara	Qashqa-darya
3m. sg.	<i>iyu</i>	<i>uww</i>	<i>hīyu</i>	<i>hūwe</i>	<i>duk</i>	<i>haw, zōk</i>
3f. sg.	<i>iya</i>	<i>iyye</i>	<i>hīya</i>	<i>hīya</i>	<i>diki</i>	<i>hay, zīka</i>
3m./c. pl	<i>iyen, annen</i>	<i>ənn</i>	<i>hīyən</i>	<i>hənnə</i>	<i>dukōla</i>	<i>zīklōn, zīklōnāt, zōkāt</i>
3f. pl	---	---	---	---	<i>dukālān</i>	<i>zīklānna</i>
2m. sg.	<i>ənt</i>	<i>int, ənta</i>	<i>ənt</i>	<i>ənta</i>	<i>hint</i>	<i>inta</i>
2f. sg.	<i>ənte</i>	<i>inte</i>	<i>ənte</i>	<i>ənti</i>	<i>hinti</i>	<i>inti</i>

2m./c. pl.	<i>ənto</i>	<i>əntu, əntən</i>	<i>ənto</i>	<i>ənten</i>	<i>hintu</i>	<i>intū, intuwāt</i>
2f. pl.	---	---	---	---	<i>hintun</i>	<i>intinna</i>
1sg.	<i>ina, īna</i>	<i>īna</i>	<i>nā</i>	<i>ana</i>	<i>ana</i>	<i>anā</i>
1pl.	<i>nāna</i>	<i>nəhne</i>	<i>naḥne</i>	<i>nəhne</i>	<i>naḥna</i>	<i>naḥna, naḥnāt</i>

Table 1. Personal Pronouns in Anatolian and Uzbekistan Arabic

As mentioned earlier, the gender distinction between 2nd and 3rd person plural has been lost in Anatolian Arabic. In Sason, the initial /h/ in 3rd person forms has disappeared, and in this respect it patterns with Xalīle, although the difference between the two dialects is readily noticeable. Regarding the development of personal pronouns, it is possible that the expected form *hīye* has become *hīya* by analogy to the 3rd pers. sg. fem. *-a*, following Jastrow's (2006a) account for Daragözü. Xalīle has preserved the vowel *e*, but has taken on the geminate form of the consonant. The forms *iyu* and *iyen* in turn are back formations from *īya*, by attaching to a base *īy-* the respective pronominal suffixes *-u* and *-en*. The 2nd person forms *ənte* and *ənto* acquired their final vowel by analogy with the inflected verb.<sup>8</sup>

Uzbekistan Arabic dialects have retained the gender distinction between 2nd and 3rd person plural, which is a rare property for Arabic dialects. Khorasan Arabic spoken in Iran is another dialect where the gender distinction in the 2nd and 3rd person pl. in verbs and pronouns has been retained (Seeger 2002, p. 634-35). Note that the forms of the personal pronouns are quite different. In QAD, the number of personal pronouns is quite high with various forms for some persons. The initial *h* is lost in QAD.

### 3.2.2. Copula

In Anatolian Arabic dialects, a copula is regularly used, yet dialects vary in their realization of the copula, its agreement features and order with respect to the predicate. Blanc (1964, p. 124) reports the rather rare use of an optional post-predicate copula in Christian Arabic of Baghdad, but the proliferation of forms and innovations is only found in Anatolia.

Table 2 illustrates the use of copula across all persons. All four dialects use the shortened version of the independent pronoun in the 3sg. and pl. The difference lies in the form of the copula utilized in other persons. Mardin, Siirt and Daragözü use the predicative copula that is identical to the personal pronoun, whereas Sason uses the demonstrative copula with *k-* (following Jastrow 1978, p. 139).

(11)

	<b>Sason</b> (Akkuş 2016)	<b>Mardin</b> (Grigore 2007a)	<b>Siirt</b> (Jastrow2006a)	<b>Daragözü</b> (Jastrow 1973)
3m. sg.	<i>iyu g<sup>o</sup>bir-ye</i>	<i>hūwe gbīr we</i>	<i>ūwe ūwe awne</i>	<i>hīyu ... -ū</i>
3f. sg.	<i>iya g<sup>o</sup>bire-ye</i>	<i>hīya gbīre ye</i>	<i>... īye awne</i>	<i>hīya lbayt-ī</i>
3pl	<i>iyen g<sup>o</sup>bir-nen</i>	<i>hənnə gbār ənnə</i>	<i>... ənnə awne</i>	<i>hīyən ... -ən</i>
2m. sg.	<i>ənt g<sup>o</sup>bir kənt</i>	<i>ənt gbīr ənt</i>	<i>... ənt awne</i>	<i>ənt məni ənt</i>
2f. sg.	<i>ənte g<sup>o</sup>bire kənte</i>	<i>ənti gbīre ənti</i>	<i>... ənti awne</i>	<i>ənte ... ənte</i>
2pl	<i>ənto g<sup>o</sup>bir kənto</i>	<i>ənten gbār ənten</i>	<i>...ənten awne</i>	<i>ənto ... ənte</i>
1sg.	<i>īna g<sup>o</sup>bir kəntu</i>	<i>ana gbīr ana</i>	<i>... anā awne</i>	<i>nā ḅāš nā</i>
1pl.	<i>nāna g<sup>o</sup>bir kənnə</i>	<i>nəhne gbār nəhne</i>	<i>... nəhne awne</i>	<i>naḥne ... nəhne</i>

Table 2. Copula Paradigm

Sason and Mardin differ in their realization of number feature on the predicate. In Mardin, the plural form of the predicative adjective, i.e. *gbār* is used in agreement with a plural subject. In Sason, on the other hand, the realization of number agreement is optional, hence either the singular *g<sup>3</sup>bir* or the plural *gbār* can be used.

The sentences *iyu kū raxu* ‘he is sick’ and *iya kī raxue* ‘she is sick’ are illustrations of the demonstrative copula in Sason Arabic.<sup>9</sup> Jastrow (1978) suggests that *kū* and *kī* in Anatolian Arabic are abbreviated versions of *kūwe* and *kīye*, respectively. Interestingly, while the copula forms *-ye* and *-nen* must follow the predicate, the 3rd person singular and plural demonstrative pronouns *kū*, *kī* and *kanno* may only precede the predicate. Therefore, for instance *iyu raxu kū* is ungrammatical. This suggests that the demonstrative copula forms with *k-* came to acquire different distributional and syntactic properties, e.g. they may function as verbal auxiliaries, e.g. *kū yamel* ‘he is working’, whereas the pronominal copulas cannot. Moreover, the two types of copula differ in their morphophonological properties. The pronominal copula does not carry (contrastive/exhaustive) stress (Jastrow 2006a, Talay 2001, Lahdo 2009), unlike the verbal auxiliary root *KWN*.

Sason Arabic and Khorasan Arabic exhibit an interesting contrast in their realization of the copula. The two dialects make use of an enclitic personal pronoun in the 3rd person, but they differ with respect to 1st and 2nd person. Sason makes use of native material, in that it employs the past auxiliary form for the present tense, which leads to ambiguity that gets resolved through temporal adverbs, e.g. *ina kattu raxu* ‘I am sick / I was sick’. In Khorasan Arabic, in contrast, the Persian loan *hatt* (< Pers. *hast* ‘he/she/it is/exists’) is in use, e.g. *mitalmân hattan* ‘you (f.) are muslims’ (Seeger 2002, p. 637). This shows that the two dialects diverge in their choice of the copula in 1st and 2nd person, while they have taken the same path for the 3rd person.

The copula in affirmative and negative sentences in Sason is illustrated in Table 3. Note that gender agreement is not marked in positive constructions, but only in negatives, unlike other *qaltu*-dialects, which show agreement in gender in affirmative sentences as well.

(12)

Copula	Positive	Negative
3m.sg	<i>ye</i>	<i>mū/mou/mow</i>
3f.sg	<i>ye</i>	<i>mī/mey</i>
3pl	<i>nen</i>	<i>mennen</i>

Table 3. Copula in Sason Arabic

Anatolian dialects differ in the order of the copula with respect to the negation marker and the predicate. In Sason the order is [predicate+negation+copula], e.g. *nihane men-nen* ‘they are not here’. In most Anatolian Arabic dialects, including Kinderib, negation and the copula precede the predicate, hence [negation+copula+predicate], e.g. *mawwe fə-lbayt* ‘he is not at home’ (Jastrow 2006a, p. 91). In Mardin, on the other hand, negation may precede the predicate, while the copula follows it, e.g. *mō fə-lbayt-we* ‘he is not at home’ (Jastrow 2006a, p. 92).

In Central Asian Arabic dialects, Uzbekistan Arabic seems to lack a copula, whereas QAD has an enclitic copula, e.g. *əlwalad maliḥ-we* ‘the boy is good’, *əlbənt maliḥa-ye* ‘the girl is good’ (Jastrow 1997, p. 145).

As a final note on morphology, Bukhara and QAD dialects have different forms of the pronominal suffixes 3sg.m and 3sg.f. (e.g. in Bukhara *rās-u* ‘his hair’, *aḡib-u* ‘I’ll bring him’; cf. in QAD *zeyl-a* ‘his tail’, *abī-a* ‘I’ll sell him’ (Jastrow 2014, p. 208). Whereas the Bukhara dialect



has the pronominal suffix *-u*, which is typical for sedentary dialects, the suffix *-a* found in QAD is typical for Bedouin dialects.

### 3.3. Syntax

In terms of syntactic change, Central Asian Arabic dialects are further ahead of Anatolian Arabic dialects, which also show variations across varieties.

Jastrow (2006a, p. 94) points to a tendency to drop the definite article while retaining it before a preposition in Kozluk-Sason-Muş group, e.g. Daragözü *baqər zā'o* ‘the cows got lost’, *kalb jā* ‘the dog came’, but *ṭala mē ddaḥle* ‘he came out of the wood’.

An interesting phenomenon in Anatolian Arabic is the use of verbo-nominal expressions with the verb *sawa* ‘to do, make’ of the type that is usually found in loans from Arabic in other languages, rather than the other way round. According to Versteegh (1997, p. 215), this construction is most likely a calque of Turkish expressions with *etmek* ‘do’. In Anatolian dialects, many expressions of this kind are found, not only with Turkish words, but also with Arabic words: *sawa talaḥōn* ‘to call by telephone’, *sawa ṭṣāra* ‘to give a sign’, *sawa mḥāfaza* ‘to protect’ (Versteegh 1997, 215).

Jastrow (2006) also mentions that whereas in most Anatolian dialects, a definite object usually follows the verb, e.g. Kinderib *ša altu ṣṣōba* ‘I lit the oven’, the Kozluk-Sason-Muş group behaves differently. In this group, the object noun usually precedes the verb which takes an enclitic, e.g. Daragözü *čəḥṭ wātna nšil-ən* ‘we take our rifles (lit: our rifles, we take them).’ In Section 4, I will suggest that the change that Sason dialect has undergone is more extensive than previously reported, thus supporting the view of a continuum of change from Mardin (most conservative) to Uzbekistan Arabic (most innovative), with Sason Arabic being intermediate between the two ends.

In Central Asian Arabic dialects, important contact-induced changes generally occurred in the domain of syntax, in fact to such an extent that Ratcliffe (2005, p. 141) calls this dialect a ‘metatypy’ in the sense of Ross (1996) and Jastrow (2005, p. 133), as an independent language that derived from vernacular Arabic. In point of fact, Uzbekistan Arabic is unique in displaying SOV as its basic word order.<sup>10</sup>

- (13) *dabba ijir zarab* (Ratcliffe 2005, ex. 9)  
horse leg struck  
‘The horse thrashed its legs’

Versteegh (1984, p. 451) suggests that this word order, which originated as a stylistic alternative to the more common SVO order, has become the unmarked word order in Central Asian Arabic dialects, under the influence of Uzbek. Syntactic changes due to contact with adstratum languages are observed in relative clauses as well. Following the Turkic pattern, the relative clause precedes the head noun, which is quite foreign to Arabic.

- (14) *Iskandar muḥl-un fad amīr kon* (Ratcliffe 2005, ex. 29)  
Alexander saying-PL(?) one prince was  
‘There was a prince (whom) they called Alexander.’

The influence of contact is observable in the nominal domain as well, for instance in the development of the genitive-possessive construction. Some of the other morphosyntactic properties Uzbekistan Arabic developed due to contact are as follows:

- The use of ‘light verbs’ in compounds, such as *sava* ‘to do’, most likely as a calque from Tajik and Uzbek.
- The loss of the definite article and the introduction of an indefinite article *fad*, e.g. *fat mara kōnet* ‘There was a woman’ vs. *mara qōlet* ‘The woman said’ (Jastrow 2005, p. 135). Following the pattern found in Iranian and Turkic, Uzbekistan Arabic leaves the definite noun unmarked and uses an indefiniteness marker with the indefinite noun.
- The presence of postpositions in addition to the inherited Arabic prepositions.
- The use of the Turkic question particle *mi* in interrogatives.

(15) *tōxedni mi?* (Jastrow 2005, p. 139)  
 you-take-me QP  
 ‘Will you marry me?’

- The use of a definite object marker *i-* to mark the definite verbal objects, e.g. *i-xaṭīb ḡabtu* ‘She fetched the mollah’ (Jastrow 2005, p. 136). This reflects the differential object marker *-rā* in Persian and the accusative case *-(y)I* in Turkish, which marks the definite object, e.g. *kitab-ı okudu* ‘she read the book’.

The final position of the verb is attested in the Khorasan dialect as well, which Seeger (2002, p. 636) attributes to the potential influence of Persian: e.g. *aḥne fiḡ-ḡidīm mālḡâr kunne* ‘we were herdsmen in olden days’ or *šītin marīd* ‘I don’t want anything’ (Seeger 2002, 638).

#### 4 SASON ARABIC: A CASE STUDY

This section focuses on one Arabic variety, Sason Arabic, as a case study, since it seems to be in the middle of the continuum of change. Thus it serves an appropriate example from which other dialects can be referred to.

Sason Arabic is a part of the Kozluk-Sason-Muş dialect group, and is usually spoken in a forbidding mountain range which extends from Siirt northwards to the plain of Muş. The data in this chapter comes from the villages of Purşeng, Batman and Kuzzi, Bitlis.

##### 4.1. Phonology

Since most of the phonological properties have been illustrated in section 3.1 in comparison with other dialects, I will discuss only one phonological process in this section. One word-level phonological process found in Sason Arabic affects the feminine marker in the perfective form. In Sason when the object is nonspecific, the 3rd person feminine suffix is /e/, as in *Herdem qare kitāb* ‘Herdem did book-reading’, but when the object is specific, requiring a clitic on the verb, the vowel undergoes reduction to /-ə/ and /-d/ or another consonant dictated by the suffix surfaces, e.g. *Herdem kitāb qarrədu* ‘Herdem read the book’.

The same process is observed in nominals as well. A noun with a final /-e/ undergoes the same phenomenon when a suffix is attached, as in *amme* ‘aunt’ > *ammædi* ‘my aunt’, or *baġle* ‘mule’ > *baġlænna* ‘our mule’.

## 4.2. Morphology

### 4.2.1. Verbal Modifier

Sason Arabic has the particle *kə-*, *k-*, similar to *k-* in Hasköy dialect (Talay 2001, p. 84) and the verbal modifier *kəl-* that Isaksson (2005, p. 187) notes for the Sason area. Talay calls this prefix *imperfektive Vergangenheit* ‘imperfective past’. The example (16) shows that the prefixal particle does really express imperfective past. In addition to the imperfective verb, in Sason *kə-* attaches to the perfective verb as well and expresses past perfect meaning as in (17). This function shows that *kə-* is not just an imperfective past marker, at least in Sason Arabic.

(16) *kə-yayel (le adaštun)*  
‘he was eating (when I saw him).’

(17) *kə-ayal (le adaštun)*  
‘He had eaten (when I saw him).’

Isaksson defines the verbal modifier *kəl-* in Xalīle as a particle that “before the perfect marks the perfect tense”, with the example *bōwš kəl-štaġal ingilzġa* ‘He has spoken much English’. In the example, the perfective form of the verb ‘speak’ is used, hence the expected reading is ‘he had spoken much English’, i.e. past perfect, not present perfect. The fact that it is compatible with the adverb *ams* ‘yesterday’, but not *sa* ‘now’ shows that, at least in Sason, the meaning is past perfect.

(18) *ams bōš kə-štaġal ingilzġa*  
‘He had spoken much English yesterday’

(19) *\*sa bōš kə-štaġal ingilzġa*  
Intended: ‘He has spoken much English now’

### 4.2.2. Demonstrative Pronouns

The following are the demonstrative pronouns in Sason Arabic, which are quite distinct from other Anatolian dialects.

	<i>Near deixis</i>	<i>Remote deixis</i>
(20) <b>sg.</b>		
m.	<i>ala</i>	<i>aya, ay</i>
f.	<i>ali</i>	<i>ayi</i>
<b>pl.</b>		
m./f.	<i>alu</i>	<i>ayu</i>

The gender distinction has been lost in plural forms. In Xalīle, in Hasköy and the Ağde dialects, the consonant in the singular forms is *z*, e.g. *āza* (m), *āzi* (f) for near deixis, and *āzu* for common

plural. In remote deixis, the masculine form is reported as 'āk < āg (cf. Jastrow 1978, p. 108). The shift from *k/g* > *y* reflects change in the form of the 2sg. masc. pronominal suffix.

#### 4.2.3. Negation

The form of the negative marker depends on the aspect of the verb: *mā* is used in the perfective, e.g. *mā-ja* 'he did not come' and *mō/mə/mi* is used in the imperfective form of the verb. 1st person sg. marker *ā-* is elided before *mō*, e.g. *mōčči* 'I will not come'.

In nominal sentences, the negative marker for 3rd sg. masc. is *mū/mow*, for 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. fem. *mī/mey*, e.g. *raxue mey* 'she is not sick' and for 3rd pl. *mennen*. The form of the negation is *mā* in other persons. In optative and imperatives, the form *lā* is used, e.g. *lā təči* 'don't come' (see Table 3).

#### 4.2.4. Existential Particle (Pseudoverb *ifī*)

Sason Arabic uses the existential particle *ifī* 'there' in both existential and possessive constructions, e.g. *ifī kelpteyn qaddam bābe* 'there are two dogs in front of the door', *ifanna zəgārteyn* 'we have two children'.

Note that in both existential and possessive constructions, the opposite pattern is observed regarding the form of the negative and the tense reference. In the present tense, which is correlated with the imperfective, the form *mā* is used, e.g. *mā-fī* 'There is not', while in past *mə* is preferred, e.g. *mə-kī-fī* (or *məkfi*) 'There was not'.

Another interesting property is that in possessives the form *existential* + *dative clitic* is observed, e.g. *ifə-nni kelp-ma* 'I have a dog'.

### 4.3. Syntax

Sason Arabic (as well as the Kozluk-Sason-Muş dialect group) manifests significant contact-induced changes in the domain of syntax. In fact it is probably the dialect with the most drastic changes due to contact. This section illustrates several syntactic constructions that are attributable to change as a result of contact with the surrounding dominant languages, primarily Turkish and Kurdish.

#### 4.3.1. (In)definiteness marking

One of most obvious syntactic changes due to contact relates to the marking of indefiniteness in Sason Arabic. In Arabic dialects an indefinite N(oun) P(hrase) is unmarked, while the definite NP is marked by the article *al-*, *əl-*, *il-* e.g. *ʔaSiide* 'a poem', *l-ʔaSiide* 'the poem' from Lebanese Arabic. Sason Arabic exhibits the opposite pattern found in Iranian and Turkic languages, e.g. *bağle* 'the mule', *bağle-ma* 'a mule' (see section 3.3 for a similar change in Uzbekistan Arabic due to contact with Uzbek and Tajik).

Sason Arabic uses the enclitic *-ma* to mark the indefiniteness of an NP (This marker is found in Hasköy as well, Talay 2001). This indefinite element is unique to the Sason group and might reflect Old Arabic *-maa* 'some'. The following are examples from Kurdish and Turkish that show the markedness of the indefinite NP.

- (21) *mirov* > *miróvek* (Kurdish)  
the man > a man

- (22) *adam* > *bir adam* (Turkish)  
the man > a man

This change in the pattern is corroborated by the constructions which show the definiteness effect. For instance, existential constructions disallow definite NPs: thus in English one can say *There is a bird on the roof*, but not *There is the bird on the roof*. Similarly, in Sason in existentials only the form with the enclitic *-ma* is permitted, e.g. *ifi atsūra-ma fo fəstox* ‘There is a bird on the roof’. The absence of *-ma* renders the sentence ungrammatical.

The following examples show the marking of referentiality in Sason and its interaction with word order.

- |      |    |   |                         |     |
|------|----|---|-------------------------|-----|
| (23) | a. | <i>naze masag-e atsūra</i>  | “non-referential”       | SVO |
|      |    | ‘Naze caught a bird/birds’ or ‘Naze did bird-catching.’               |                         |     |
|      | b. | <i>naze atsūra masag-əd-a</i>   | definite, specific      | SOV |
|      |    | ‘Naze caught the bird.’   |                         |     |
|      | c. | <i>naze masag-e atsūra-ma</i>   | non-specific/indefinite | SVO |
|      |    | ‘Naze caught a bird.’   |                         |     |
|      | d. | <i>naze atsūra-ma masag-əd-a</i>                                      | specific/indefinite     | SOV |
|      |    | ‘Naze caught a certain bird’ or ‘A bird is such that Naze caught it.’ |                         |     |

The basic word order in transitive sentences is SVO in Sason, and the position of the object changes depending on its referential properties. In (23)a the bare noun *atsūra* expresses a reading that comes close to an incorporated reading in that it expresses an activity reading. The NP is non-referential and number-neutral as the distinction between the singular and plural is neutralized with the sentence having the unmarked SVO order. In (23)b, on the other hand, the same bare noun *atsūra* is interpreted as a definite NP since it occurs in preverbal position (forming the SOV order) and more importantly the predicate is inflected with the object pronoun *-a* to allow this reading. The form *atsūrama* in (23)c is translated as an indefinite/nonspecific NP with the indefinite element *-ma*. The example (23)d shows that what is being marked is not *definiteness*, but *specificity*. Crucially Turkish has the same four-way distinction in marking of referentiality (cf. Akkuş and Benmamoun, to appear).

#### 4.3.2. Light verb constructions (Verbo-nominal expressions)

Light verb constructions are another domain where the influence of contact is observed. In surrounding languages such as Kurdish and Turkish the form of light verbs is ‘nominal + light verb’, e.g. Kurdish *pacî kirin* (kiss do) ‘to kiss’, Turkish *rapor etmek* (report do) ‘to report’.

Light verb constructions in Sason are also formed with a nominal and the light verb *asi* ‘to do’. The nominal part in Sason can be borrowed from Turkish as in (24)b, or Kurdish as in (24)c or might be Arabic (24)a. Versteegh (1997) argues that this is ‘a calque’ of Turkish *etmek* (cf. section 3.3).

- (24) a. *meraq asi*      b. **qazan** asi < Turkish      c. **ser** asi < Kurdish  
wonder do              win do                      watch do  
‘I wonder’                ‘I win’                      ‘I watch’

The data provides support to this argument and also shows that Sason has adopted a head final property like the languages it is in contact with.

#### 4.3.3. *Periphrastic causative*

Sason Arabic resorts to periphrastic causative and applicative constructions rather than the root and pattern strategy found in other non-peripheral Arabic varieties, on a par with Kurdish, which uses the light verb *bıdın* ‘give’ to form the causative (25).

- (25) *mi piskilet do çekır-in-e*  
I.ACC bicycle.NOM give.PART repair.PART-GERUND-OBL  
‘I had the bicycle repaired (lit: ‘I gave the bicycle to repairing).’ (Atlamaz 2012, p. 62)

Sason also displays the same strategy for causative and applicative formation, as illustrated in (26). This could be as a result of its extensive contact with Kurdish.

- (26) *ado dolab-ad-en addil*  
gave.3PL shelf-PL-their making  
‘They had their shelves repaired (lit: ‘They gave their shelves to repairing).’

The discussion thus far illustrates that Sason Arabic has undergone drastic syntactic changes due to contact, more so than other Anatolian varieties. Some changes, e.g. definiteness marking, light verb constructions, are similar to Uzbekistan Arabic dialects. Based on these empirical facts (see also Jastrow 2007), I propose the following line of continuum of change for dialects in terms of the extent of changes they have undergone, which is in line with their geographical location.

- (27) **Conservative** -----> **Innovative**  
Mardin                      Siirt, Diyarbakır ...                      Sason, Khorasan ...                      Uzbekistan Arabic

Note that the dialects here are representative and more dialects could be placed in this continuum. Naturally, this classification is not meant to be a clear-cut separation: while a dialect might be most innovative in many aspects, it can be quite conservative in some other respect, e.g. Sason Arabic in terms of the preservation of *-ma*.

#### 4.3.4. *Expression of Tense/Aspect*

Sason Arabic does not distinguish between general present, present continuous and future. Therefore, *yamel* is ambiguous between ‘He works’, ‘He is working’ and ‘He will work.’ The present continuous can also be marked via the verbal auxiliary, e.g. *kū yamel* ‘he is working’.

Intention is expressed by *te-* prefixed to the imperfect verb, e.g. *te-ičo* ‘they shall come’. This prefix is realized as *tə-* in Mardin and as *de-* in Siirt dialect.

## 5 PRESENT SITUATION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As pointed out in section 2, Otto Jastrow was among the first, if not the first, to explore many of the *qəltu* dialects, especially those east of Diyarbakır. His endeavor was taken up by his former students and other researchers, e.g. Arnold (1998), Procházka (2002), Talay (2001, 2002); Wittrich (2001), Grigore (2007), Lahdo (2009), Akkuş (to appear, 2016). In comparison to the *gilit* dialects, *qəltu* dialects have been better studied. However, in terms of linguistic description, for instance Anatolian Arabic dialects are not equally well covered. Mardin dialects have been covered much more comprehensively than other dialects, including a number of publications by Otto Jastrow. In the last few years, a comprehensive investigation was carried out in the regions of Çukurova and Hatay, by Stephan Procházka and Werner Arnold, respectively.

The Siirt and Diyarbakır dialects have been very little studied. Our current knowledge of them comes from Jastrow (1978), and Lahdo (2009) for the former. In the case of Diyarbakır dialect, the lack of competent speakers is a major obstacle for future research.

The least investigated dialects are those of the Kozluk-Sason-Muş group, except for Talay's (2001, 2002) important research, and several studies on Sason Arabic by Faruk Akkuş. There are still areas, especially the mountainous areas between Kozluk and Muş, which require fieldwork in order to get a better picture of these dialects. For instance, in Mutki of Bitlis province alone there are more than 10 villages where Arabic is spoken. Research on the varieties spoken in the villages of Bitlis and the neighboring villages of Batman will certainly enrich our knowledge of their history.

In the case of Central Asian Arabic dialects, Bukhara Arabic is the better studied variety of the two Uzbekistan Arabic dialects with more material available. However, most of the data is fragmented, particularly in the case of QAD. Ulrich Seeger's (2002, 2009, 2013) studies of the Arabic spoken in Iran, and Bruce Ingham's work on Arabic in Afghanistan are very valuable. However, these dialects also await further fieldwork.

In terms of the linguistic features investigated, phonological and morphological properties (along with lexicon) have received more attention, whereas syntax, in particular, has been understudied (with the exception of Uzbekistan Arabic). For instance, Borg's (1985) important book on Cypriot Maronite Arabic contains very little discussion of syntax. This situation, however, might change since we are now at a point where we have enough recordings and transcriptions to investigate syntactic properties of the dialects.

## REFERENCES

- Akkuş, F., To appear. Sason Arabic. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics Online*. Rudolf de Jong, ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Akkuş, F., 2016. The Arabic Dialect of Mutki-Sason Areas. In: George Grigore and Babriel Biţună, eds. *Arabic Varieties: Far and Wide. Proceedings of the 11th Conference of AIDA*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti. 29-41.
- Akkuş, F, and Benmamoun, E., To appear. Syntactic Outcomes of Contact in Sason Arabic. In: Stefano Manfredi, Mauro Tosco and Giorgio Banti eds. *Arabic in Contact*. In: *Studies in Arabic Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aoun, J., and Benmamoun, E., 1998. Minimality, Reconstruction, and PF Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 29, 569–592.

- Arnold, W., 2007. The Arabic Dialect of the Jews of Iskenderun. In: George Grigore, ed. *Romano-Arabica VI-VII: Peripheral Arabic Dialects*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București. 7-12.
- Atlamaz, Ü., 2012. Ergative as Accusative Case: Evidence from Adıyaman Kurmanji. Thesis (MA). Boğaziçi University.
- Blanc, H., 1964. *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (Harvard Middle Eastern Monographs X).
- Borg, A., 1985. *Cypriot Arabic: A Historical and Comparative Investigation into the Phonology and Morphology of the Arabic Vernacular spoken by the Maronites of Kormakiti Village in the Kyrenia District of North-Western Cyprus*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.
- Borg, A., 1997. Cypriot Arabic Phonology. In: Alan S. Kaye, ed. *Phonologies of Asia and Africa*. Indiana: Eisenbrauns. 219-244.
- Borg, A., 2004. *A Comparative Glossary of Cypriot Maronite Arabic (Arabic-English): with an introductory essay*. Leiden: Brill.
- Chikovani, G., 2000. The Qashqadarian Arabic Dialect of Central Asia (Nominal Structures). In: Manwel Mifsud, ed. *Proceedings of the 3rd AIDA Conference*. 189–194.
- Chikovani, G., 2005. Linguistic Contacts in Central Asia. In: Éva Agnes Csató, Bo Isaksson, and Carina Jahani, eds. *Linguistic Convergence and Areal Divergence: Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. Routledge: New York. 127-132.
- Cinque, G., 1990. *Types of A-dependencies*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Grigore, G., 2007a. L'énoncé non verbal dans l'arabe parlé à Mardin. *Romano-Arabica*, N: 6-7.
- Grigore, G., 2007b. *L'Arabe parlé à Mardin. Monographie d'un parler arabe périphérique*. București: Editura Universității din București.
- Hadjidemetriou, C., 2007. Kormakiti Maronite Arabic: prospect of documentation and community response. In: Peter K. Austin, Oliver Bond & David Nathan, eds. *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentation & Linguistic Theory*. London. 115-122.
- Ingham, B., 1994. The effect of language contact on the Arabic dialect of Afghanistan. In: Jordi Aguadé, Federico Corriente, and Marina Marugan, eds. *Actas del congreso internacional sobre interferencias lingüísticas Árabo-Romances y paralelos extra-Iberos*. Saragossa: Navarro y Navarro. 105-117.
- Ingham, B., 2005. Afghanistan Arabic. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill. 1, 28–35.
- Isaksson, B., 2005. New Linguistic Data from the Sason Area in Anatolia. In: Éva Agnes Csató, Bo Isaksson, and Carina Jahani, eds. *Linguistic Convergence and Areal Divergence: Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. Routledge. New York. 181-190.
- Jastrow, O., 1973. *Daragözü: Eine arabische Mundart der Kozluk-Sason-Gruppe (Südostanatolien)*. Nürnberg: Hans Carl.
- Jastrow, O., 1978. *Die mesopotamisch-arabischen qaltu-Dialekte. Band I: Phonologie und Morphologie*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Jastrow, O., 1997. Wie Arabisch ist Uzbekistan Arabisch?. In: E. Wardine, ed. *Built on Solid Rock: Studies in Honour of Professor Ebbe Egede Knudsen on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Oslo: Novus. 141-153.
- Jastrow, O., 2005. Uzbekistan Arabic: A Language Created by Semitic-Iranian-Turkic Linguistic Convergence. In: Éva Agnes Csató, Bo Isaksson, and Carina Jahani, eds. *Linguistic Convergence and Areal Divergence: Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. Routledge. New York. 133-139.



- Jastrow, O., 2006a. Anatolian Arabic. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill. 87-96.
- Jastrow, O., 2006b. Arabic dialects in Turkey - towards a comparative typology. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları*, 16, 153-164.
- Jastrow, O., 2007. Where do we stand in the research on the Anatolian *qaltu* dialects?. In: George Grigore, ed. *Romano-Arabica VI-VII: Peripheral Arabic Dialects*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București. 63-70.
- Jastrow, O., 2014. Dialect Differences in Uzbekistan Arabic and Their Historical Implications. In: Olivier Durand, Angela Daiana Langone, Giuliano Mion, eds. *Proceedings of the 9th AIDA Conference*. Vienna: LIT Verlag. 205-212.
- Kieffer, C., 2000. The Arabic speech of Bactria (Afghanistan). In: Jonathan Owens, ed. *Arabic as a Minority Language*. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 181-198.
- Lahdo, A., 2009. *The Arabic Dialect of Tillo in the Region of Siirt (South-eastern Turkey)*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 26. Uppsala.
- Owens, J., 2001. Creole Arabic: The orphan of all orphans. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 43, 348–378.
- Owens, J., 2009. *A Linguistic History of Arabic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, M. D., 1996. Contact-induced change and the comparative method: cases from Papua New Guinea. In: Malcolm Ross and Mark Durie, eds. *The comparative method reviewed: regularity and irregularity in language change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 180-217.
- Seeger, U., 2002. Zwei Texte im Dialekt der Araber von Chorasán. In: Werner Arnold and Hartmut Bobzin, eds. *'Sprich doch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch, wir verstehen es!' 60 Beiträge zur Semitistik - Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 629-646.
- Seeger, U., 2009. Khalaf - Ein arabisches Dorf in Khorasan. *Philologisches und Historisches zwischen Anatolien und Sokotra Analecta Semitica In Memoriam Alexander Sima*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 307–317
- Talay, S., 2001. Der arabische Dialekt von Hasköy (Dēr Khās), Ostanatolien. I. Grammatische Skizze. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik*, 40, 71-89.
- Talay, S., 2002. Der arabische Dialekt von Hasköy (Dēr Khās), Ostanatolien. II. Texte und Glossar. *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik*, 41, 46-86.
- Talay, S., 2011. Arabic Dialects of Mesopotamia. In: Stefan Weninger et al., eds. *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton. 909-919.
- Tosco, M. and Manfredi, S., 2013. Pidgins and Creoles. In: Jonathan Owens, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Arabic Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Tsiapera, M., 1969. *A descriptive analysis of Cypriot Maronite Arabic*. Paris: Mouton.
- Versteegh, K., 1984. Word order in Uzbekistan Arabic and Universal Grammar. *Orientalia Suecana*, 33(4), 443-453.
- Versteegh, K., 1997. *The Arabic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wittrich, M., 2001. *Der arabische Dialekt von Āzāx*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

#### **FURTHER READING**

- Arnold, W. 1998. *Die arabischen Dialekte Antiochiens*. Wiesbaden. (Semitica Viva 19)
- Chikovani, G., 2001. Some Peculiarities of Verb Formation in the Qashqa-darya Arabic Dialect in Central Asia. *Orientalist*, 1, 58–66.

- Csató, É. A., Isaksson, B., and Jahani, C. eds., 2005. *Linguistic Convergence and Areal Divergence: Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. Routledge: New York.
- Ingham, B., 2005. Afghanistan Arabic. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill. 1, 28–35.
- Jastrow, O., 2006a. Anatolian Arabic. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill. 87-96.
- Owens, J., 2013. ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Arabic Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Procházka, S., 2002. *Die arabischen Dialekte der Çukurova (Südtürkei)*. Wiesbaden (Semitica Viva 27)
- Seeger, U. 2013. Zum Verhältnis der zentralasiatischen arabischen Dialekte. In: Renaud Kutu, Ulrich Seeger and Shabo Talay, eds. *Nicht nur mit Engelszungen. Beiträge zur semitischen Dialektologie. Festschrift für Werner Arnold zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 313–322.

### BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Faruk Akkuş is a PhD student in Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania. His work mainly focuses on typological and theoretical aspects of peripheral Arabic dialects, Turkish and Zazaki, with particular interest to copula and negation. An extended version of his master's thesis is to be published by Brill as a monograph.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Stephen Anderson for his valuable comments and suggestions, and the editors for their remarks that improved the quality of the article.

### Word Count: 7399

<sup>1</sup> In this chapter I will not deal with Maltese, which is another Arabic vernacular spoken outside the Arab countries.

<sup>2</sup> The comparison between Central Asian Arabic and Arabic creoles has already been drawn by Owens (2001, p. 353) who argues that unlike creoles whose source of structure is generally opaque, that of Uzbekistan Arabic is relatively transparent, being directly linked to the pervasive influence of adstratal languages (cf. Tosco and Manfredi 2013, p. 498).

<sup>3</sup> The term Mesopotamian Arabic and the classification here rely on Blanc's (1964) seminal book *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*, which is an investigation of Arabic spoken in three religious communities (Muslims, Jews, and Christians), who spoke radically different dialects despite living in the same town. Based on the word "I said"- *qultu* in Classical Arabic- Blanc called the Jewish and Christian dialects *qəltu* dialects, and the Muslim dialect a *gilit* dialect.

<sup>4</sup> For an overview of Arabic dialects mainly spoken in Iran alongside some discussion of Central Asian dialects, see Seeger (2002, 2013).

<sup>5</sup> By Sason Arabic, I refer to the dialect spoken in the villages of Purşeng, Batman and Kuzzi, Bitlis. The linguistic data in this article come from those villages. This dialect manifests significant differences from the one Bo Isaksson (2005) documented in the village of Xalile. See section 4. The reader is also referred to Akkuş (to appear) for further discussion.

<sup>6</sup> Jastrow (2005, p. 134) argues that emphatic (pharyngealized) consonants are due to Tseretelli and Vinnikov's conservative and historicizing transcription.

<sup>7</sup> Note that the word *mazgün* 'sickle' has undergone metathesis in Sason Arabic, unlike its realization in Kinderib where it preserved the original order of word-medial consonants *magzün*.

<sup>8</sup> For comprehensive discussion of verbal inflection, see Jastrow 1978, 2006a, Talay 2001, 2011, Grigore 2007b, Lahdo 2009, a.o.

<sup>9</sup> I use the term 'demonstrative copula' without committing to it. Such forms may also be regarded as 'verbal copula' since they are used with 'participles' in a verbal clause to form progressive interpretations.

---

<sup>10</sup> I should note that this may be more complicated than it is usually presented, since Ratcliffe (2015, p. 144) notes that whereas (S)OV is occasionally found, SOV-o, SOOV-oo orders are much more commonly found, where ‘-o’ refers to an encliticized pronoun referring back to the nominal object.

- i. *sakina*      *xadā-ha*                      (Ratcliffe 2005, ex. 10)  
knife              (he) took-it  
‘He took a knife.’

This looks like an instance of so-called Clitic Left-Dislocation (Cinque 1990), where a dislocated element relates to or binds a pronominal clitic within the clause. This is in fact a common property in non-peripheral Arabic dialects, as shown in the following example from Lebanese Arabic.

- ii. *naadya*      *šu*      *ʔaalət-la*      *l-mʕallme?*      (Aoun and Benmamoun 1998, ex. 6)  
Nadia              what      said.3F-her.DAT      the-teacher  
‘Nadia, what did the teacher say to her?’